

## **SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**DATE:** August 2, 2002  
**TO:** Ross Dunfee, Steering Committee Chairman  
Tony Barrett, Department of Ecology  
**COPY:** Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Members and Consultant Team  
**FROM:** Dave Moss, Tt/KCM  
**SUBJECT:** **Summary of Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Meeting**  
**Moses Lake Conference Center**  
**July 25, 2002 9:00 am – 3:00 pm**  
**PROJECT:** EASTERN WASHINGTON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT  
Stormwater Management Technical Manual *and*  
Model Municipal NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program

### **Subcommittee Meeting Attendees:**

Melodie Selby – Ecology	Steve Hansen – City of Spokane
Tony Barrett – Ecology	Dave Kliewer – JUB Engineers
Karen Dinicola – Ecology	Jocelyne Gray – JUB Engineers
Michael Hepp – Ecology	Dave Moss – TetraTech/KCM
Steve King – City of Wenatchee	Gary Nelson – Spokane County
Gary Beeman – WSDOT	John Hohman – Spokane County
Steve Worley – Spokane County	Gloria Mantz – Spokane County
Nancy Aldrich – City of Richland	Colleen Little – Spokane County
	Khalid Marcus – Yakima County

### **PURPOSE OF MEETING:**

This meeting was held to gather the core subcommittee members and at-large members for:

- Discuss Updated Production Schedule; Review Major Issue Summary
- Partial review of Chapter 1 (Introduction)
- Comprehensive review of Chapter 2 (Core Elements)
- Reviews of Chapters 4, 5 & 6 (if time available)

## AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING:

1. Brief review of July 11 Meeting
2. Updated Schedule; Review status of Key Issues
3. Partial review of Chapter 1 – Introduction
4. Review Chapter 2 – Core Elements (review in conjunction with written input from subcommittee members)
5. Working lunch (15 minute break)
6. Review Chapter 4 – Hydrologic Analysis and Design (*time not available; deferred to next meeting*)
7. Review Chapter 5 – Detention and Infiltration Design (*time not available; deferred to next meeting*)
8. Review Chapter 6 – Water Quality Facility Design (*time not available; deferred to next meeting*)
9. Next meeting agenda; other pertinent topics

## BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

1. Introductions; sign-in; review and update the agenda to review chapters in numerical order.
2. Dave Moss noted the “two-projector” format for this meeting. Dave would show agenda and other pertinent documents on his powerpoint projector; Steve Worley would show specific text edits per Chapter discussion.
3. Review of previous Summary from July 11 – Karen Dinicola had the following significant comments:
  - A. Clarify today on items 5.D. & 5.E. regarding dirt/gravel/BST/asphalt/concrete surfacing discussion.
  - B. Incorporate verbiage, not a diagram, for high use intersection discussion, on item 5.H.
  - C. Note that Issue Papers are abandoned, rather than not completed.
  - D. Meeting Summaries for June 13 and June 27 were updated, but there were no comments at this time.
4. Review of Key Issues: decided to just review the list for each Chapter, prior to review of the Chapter.
5. Discussion of Chapter 1:
  - A. “What is the Stormwater Manual?” Reviewed text written by Ecology, and suggested several updates:
    - 1) Colleen Little not sure that “commonly accepted” is appropriate language, in first paragraph.
    - 2) Steve King suggests describing the referenced graphic in the text, such as “Presumptive” vs. “Demonstration.”
    - 3) Gary Beeman suggests “guidance” instead of “way” in last paragraph.
    - 4) Michael Hepp suggests “chooses to follow other practices...” instead of “chooses not to follow...”
  - B. Chapter 1 includes “When To” text, other chapters are mostly “How To.”
6. Discussion of Chapter 2:
  - A. Most of the day was spent reviewing Chapter 2 in great detail. As stated above, Steve Worley inserted new text and comments into an electronic version of Chapter 2 that was posted on the FTP site on July 15, 2002. Karen Dinicola had a few additional edits in a newer version dated July 17, 2002 and these were mentioned to the subcommittee during the day’s review process. Written/verbal comments were also presented by Spokane County (Gary Nelson) and Michelle Brich (who was absent; Gary Beeman read her comments). The following is only a brief summary of the major comments and points of discussion.

- B. Karen Dinicola noted the supplemental guidelines in Chapter 2 are optional.
- C. “Drywell” was agreed to be one word. “Subsurface infiltration systems” was agreed to be used in the broader context, rather than just “drywells.”
- D. Suggestion was made to use more bullets and less paragraphs, or shorter paragraphs.
- E. Move “Guidelines” before “Objective.”
- F. Should the figure/text on drywells in Ch 6 be moved to Ch 2? No, just be clear in Ch 2 to refer to Ch 6.
- G. Spokane County’s written comments dated July 24, 2002 were passed out and were mentioned whenever appropriate. Not all comments were discussed. In the text below, where a note was taken regarding a comment discussed, it will be referenced by the nomenclature: [SC2#2] for Spokane County Chapter 2, comment #2, etc. Additional comments were included in the electronic version (edited by Steve Worley).
- H. [SC2#2] – 72-hour and 3-hour design storms were decided to be referred to as: “regional long duration design storm” and “short duration design storm” with no reference to number of hours.
- I. [SC2#3] – Table 2.A was agreed to be moved forward to the beginning of Chapter 2. Gary suggested adding the 1 acre threshold into Table 2A, but not in Figure 2A. This would be considered further, though the 1 acre threshold was suggested best to be included in the permit.
- J. [SC2#6] – Colleen Little thought “pollution generating” was going to be added in front of “pervious surface” for all of Chapter 2. This seemed okay, but should be confirmed for each entry.
- K. Mike Hepp suggested that conversion from forest practices was not exempt.
- L. Gary Nelson wondered why “non-exemptions” were listed under exemptions in section 2.1.1.
- M. Steve King shared several scenarios regarding the BST issue; this issue to be a text box topic.
- N. Gary Nelson noted “New” = “New” and “Redevelopment” = “Replacing existing.”
- O. Mike Hepp felt the 50% threshold for increased impervious surface would not trigger retrofitting in almost all existing projects. Melodie suggested this be a text box item.
- P. [SC2#7 to #15] – Spokane County discussed their several comments regarding redevelopment.
- Q. Gary Nelson asked about needing to submit the SWPPP to 2 agencies? Tony Barrett noted Phase II allows for local jurisdictions to take over from Ecology, so only 1 permit is preferred in the upcoming program; but the permit/program is not finished yet, so we will see if feasible to simplify to just one review or not.
- R. Mike Hepp suggested referencing the latest wetlands rating form for Eastern Washington, and allowing discharge to Category 4 wetlands, and Category 3 wetlands that met certain criteria (to be defined).
- S. Regarding Core Element #6 – Flow Control, Ecology believes that the long duration design storm should be the only choice in the hydrologic analysis. Several expressed concern that the new design storm would result in a large detention facility, which costs more, but may not be needed.
- T. Several people suggested an independent peer review of Flow Control be considered, such as by NRCS, Mike Barber of WSU, etc. As a first step, a Working Group for Flow Control Standards/Analysis was formed. Steve King (Wenatchee) was proposed as the chair, supported by Steve Plummer (Kennewick), Karen Dinicola (Ecology), and a representative from Spokane County and from Yakima County. The membership and “charter” for the working group would be discussed at the next meeting on August 8.
- U. It was agreed to add the Spokane River back into the flow exemptions.

- V. It was suggested that cold weather issues be considered for BMPs.
- W. Gary Nelson asked about small project exemptions and rural exemptions... where were they mentioned? Karen Dinicola noted that small projects were included in item 4 under section 2.2.6 and rural projects were included under items 2, 3 and 9 under section 2.2.6.
- X. It was suggested and agreed that subsection 2.3.3 be moved ahead of section 2.2.
- Y. Regarding one-half of the 2-year design storm versus all of the 2-year design storm for flow control, it was mentioned that one-half of the 50-year design storm was only 0.13cfs in one example, which was small, so one-half of the 2-year would likely be unmanageably small in many cases.
- Z. Ecology provided an updated graphic for Figure 2.A. to replace the text version.
- 7. Other Manual comments, suggestions and decisions:
  - A. “Drywell” was agreed to be one word. “Subsurface infiltration systems” was agreed to be used in the broader context, rather than just “drywells.”
  - B. Melodie Selby suggested not having regulatory thresholds in the Manual, just technical thresholds. Melodie also suggested all text boxes be as neutral as possible.
  - C. An “Appendix” format was suggested to address possible and expected future changes in the laws, regs, requirements, etc.
  - D. It was agreed to put the Manual’s Glossary after the Table of Contents, and to use just one Glossary.
  - E. Add to Glossary: Drainage Manual Administrator, perennial, ephemeral, water body segment.
  - F. Consider a second August meeting for August 22nd or probably August 27th (which is later).

### **PRELIMINARY AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:**

The **next meeting** will be at the Moses Lake Conference Center on **August 8, 2002**, from 9am to 3:00pm. The agenda will include:

- Review of Subcommittee agenda and summary from July 25 meeting
- Review updates to Chapter 1
- Review updates to Chapter 2
- Review Chapter 4
- Review updates to Chapter 5
- Review updates to Chapter 6
- Review latest schedule and status of major issues

*The following notes are from the flip charts (created at the meeting) from participant comments:*

Comment: instead of flip charts, Steve Worley typed the proposed edits and comments into an electronic version of Chapter 2, and projected it on the wall for the subcommittee to view during the meeting. No flip charts were prepared at this meeting.